

Once-Dear Jerry,

12/9/01

The most recent problem caused by your irresponsibilities, stupidities and the like has cost me, thus far, most of \$497 and the coming trip to the Archives, which has been medically-prohibited for years. It is what you did and or said when I asked you for the copies of the Zapruder film I gave you for Hood many years ago and I now ~~need~~ need. You have held me responsible for all your many mistakes so you can, as you have twisted your mind, hold me responsible for this great irresponsibility.

Years before my going to our basement was ~~prohibited~~ prohibited and when we were both there, when we came to the metal cabinet in which I kept all my films not in file cabinets I gave them to you for Hood and so your students could use them because I was no longer travelling and using them. They included trays of slides, sized for both TV and home uses as well as those I had used in my work, copies of reels of film, including WDSU's and WWL's, both provided by those stations and made from their originals, odds and ends of other reel films, a number of amateur versions of stolen Zapruders and two professional thefts of it both as good as the best the Commission used, 15 and 35 mm., and others I'm sure I no longer remember.

Several months ago, when the Archives had provided only photographic junk I asked you for them so I could use the 15 and 35 mms. Without taking an instant for reply and thought, you said you do not know where they are. Assuming that to be true, that is a great irresponsibility and the opposite of scholarship. As was giving your answer no thought and not promising to make an effort to get them.. At the time I gave them to you they were worth thousands. They are still of great value. Common decency and scholarship did require the search you do not say you made. It implies what I do not believe, theft.

Lillian Weisberg, who will be 89 in April, and her husband Harold, who will be 89 th t month, have had joint bank accounts and investments si ce slightly before World War II. For most of that time when he needed money, he obtained if from her. She handled all their ,omey. Since she fell down and broke a hip about three ye rs ago, they have had the reverse arrangement, he controls the assets and when she nededw finds, he provides them. He also pays her bills that come by mail. This agreement is not intended to change that arrange ment in any way. Nor will he in any way deny her and money she n~~x~~ needs, as he does not now and has not for these recent years. In practise now i is not wise for him to drive to the bsand. The woman who cares for them part-time takes the ehcks to the bank and gives them th: sums of the checks. She also makes all their deposits.

This agreement is intended to prevent errors or mistakes, which in Mrs. Weisberg's condition are now nowe likely. One cost them more than \$14,000. There almost were two additional ones for about 4,000 each. Mr. Weisberg qas able to avoid their being victimized by those frauds.

When Mrs. Weisberg was in the local hospital for the repair of that broken hip, the ho pitl al oed h r to fall again, this timr doing more damage. That repaided him was again broken and with that fall in the hospital bathroom, zs she went down her head strucky solid objects. From that she had ftwo bloody clots on her brain. They were not located until Mrs. Weisberh complained. The hospital then did admit those clots. The surgeon the hospital selected told the not to re rxpect full recovert and that in elderly people there usually is not full mental verovery.

To avoid the possible errors and mistakes from her impaired mental condition Mrs. Weisberg will avoid handling their funds and Mr. Weisberg guaranteed that he will provide her with all the funds she needs, as he has done without fail since she first broke that hij. He will also continue to pay her bills by mail, as he has done since then. He and she prefer that to protecting their interests by having her declared incompetent.

13 If you asked Jerry you now know that the Archibess can no longer make a photographic enlargement and the slaps they turn out, all that is now available, is worse than useless. And your carelessness, your x concept of scholarship that requires that you do nothing, not even make an inquiry to see if your negligence and be corrected- not even ask a simple question of those who might know where that film is, assure that it will remain suppressed, as will its clear meaning in the evidence.

And you can continue to blame for mistakes that are exclusively yours.

Aside from the totality of the dishonesty, what King of scholarship is it?

Harold